

REMARKS

All the claims submitted for examination in the present application have been rejected on formal and/or substantive grounds. In addition, five of the claims have been objected to. Applicants have amended their claims and respectfully submit that all the claims currently in this application are patentable over the objections and rejections of record.

Turning first to the objections of records, Claims 3, 4, 11, 12 and 15 have been separately objected to, under 37 C.F.R. §1.75(c), as being improperly dependent for failure to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim.

It is unnecessary to discuss the merits of these objections insofar as this issue is moot. All the claims subject to objection, Claims 3, 4, 11, 12 and 15, have been cancelled.

One formal ground of rejection is imposed in the outstanding Official Action. That rejection, imposed under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, is directed to Claims 13 to 15 as being indefinite. Specifically, Claim 13, from which Claims 14 and 15 ultimately depend, recites "wherein the organic acid.". That phrase is not provided with antecedent basis.

The Official Action is correct in assuming that the recitation of "organic acid" was inadvertent and that the term intended was --photoresist strip enhancer--. Indeed, Claim 13 has been amended to make this change. As such, this amendment to Claim 13 overcomes the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

Three substantive grounds of rejection are imposed in the outstanding Official Action. It is unnecessary to discuss the merits of the imposed grounds of substantive rejection insofar as all of them have become moot with the instant amendment. That is, three of the four independent claims originally submitted in the present application, Claims 1, 9 and 13, have been amended to incorporate therein the limitation that the photoresist strip enhancer is a

member of the Markush group originally set forth in Claims 4 and 12. The Official Action indicates that the subject matter of dependent Claims 4 and 12 are patentable. Since the amendment to Claims 1 and 9 represent Claims 4 and 12, respectively, in independent form, it is apparent that these claims were patentable.

As far as independent Claim 13 is concerned, that claim has been amended to also recite the Markush group of photoresist strip enhancers that is recited in original dependent Claims 4 and 12. As such, that claim also possesses patentable subject matter.

Dependent Claims 5 to 8 all ultimately depend from Claim 1. Therefore these claims, which further restrict an already patentable claim, are patentable.

It is noted that the fourth independent claim, Claim 16, and the claims dependent therefrom, Claims 17-20, have been cancelled. It is furthermore noted that Claims 4 and 12 have become redundant with the introduction of their subject matter into Claims 1 and 9, respectively, and have been cancelled. In addition, Claims 2, 3, 10 and 11 have also been cancelled.

It should further be appreciated that Claims 1, 5, 9 and 13 have been amended to correct improper Markush group language. In addition, Claims 1, 9 and 13 have been amended to correct obvious typographical errors resulting from the absence of articles and/or conjunctions in their recitation. Furthermore, a misspelling of --ethylbenzoin-- in Claim 5 has been corrected.

The above amendment and remarks establish the patentable nature of all the claims currently in this application. Notice of Allowance and passage to issue of these claims,

Claims 1, 5-9 and 13, is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Marvin Bressler". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Marvin Bressler
Registration No. 25,132
Attorney for Applicants

Scully, Scott, Murphy & Presser
400 Garden City Plaza
Garden City, New York 11530
516-742-4343
MB:ml